



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,071	04/07/2004	Alana King	49335.2700	7229
20222 7590 09/15/2008 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P. (Main) 400 EAST VAN BUREN ONE ARIZONA CENTER PHOENIX, AZ 85004-2202				
EXAMINER				
LIU, I JUNG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3694				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/15/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/820,071

**Applicant(s)**

KING ET AL.

**Examiner**

MARISSA LIU

**Art Unit**

3694

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scolini et al., Pub. No.: US 2003/0233321 A1, in view of Tsuei et al., US Publication Number: 2004/0083184 A1, further in view of Geiger et al, US Patent Number: 6,073,142, further in view of background of King et al., US Publication Number: 2005/0228679 A1.

3. As per claim 1, Scolini et al. teach a method for generating account statements for batch printing, comprising:

grouping a plurality of accounts for which account statements are to be generated in a batch printing run (¶ 1221; ¶ 1230);

receiving account data for each of the plurality of accounts, the account data for use in generating at least one account statement for each of the plurality of accounts (¶ 0903; ¶ 0912; ¶ 0920);

presenting, to a user, a plurality of reporting formats that are available to be assigned to at least one of the plurality of account statements, each of the plurality of reporting formats defining a printed layout of the account data for the account statements (¶ 0616; ¶ 0842; ¶ 1350);

receiving, from the user, a selection of a first account from the plurality of accounts, and a selection of a first reporting format from the plurality of reporting formats for the first account (¶ 0273; ¶ 0636; ¶ 0642);

receiving, from the user, a selection of a second account from the plurality of accounts, and a selection of a second reporting format from the plurality of reporting formats for the second account (¶ 0273; ¶ 0636; ¶ 0642);

receiving, from a user, corresponding to at least one of: the first account and the second account (¶ 0273; ¶ 0636; ¶ 0642);

assembling a directory of individual account statements, wherein said directory of individual account statements (¶ 1221; ¶ 1230; ¶ 0400; ¶ 1177; ¶ 1352; ¶ 0006; ¶ 0549, where “index” or “listing” is equivalent of “directory”);

displaying the directory of individual account statements assembled for the batch printing run (¶ 1221; ¶ 1230; ¶ 0400; ¶ 1177; ¶ 1352; ¶ 0549, where “index” or “listing” is equivalent of “directory”);

receiving, from a review, a selection of an account statement from the directory for review (¶ 0455; ¶ 01358; page 59; ¶ 1352; ¶ 0004-0006);

presenting the selected account statement to the reviewer (¶ 0642; ¶ 1221);

receiving, from the reviewer, at least one of: an approval of the selected account statement, a rejection of the selected account statement, a correction of the selected account statement, a request for regeneration of the selected account statement, and a request to delete the selected account statement (¶ 0008; ¶ 0447-0448; ¶ 0470; ¶ 1436; ¶ 0004; ¶ 0006);

generating a first account statement in the first reporting format for the first account and a second account statement in the second reporting format for the second account, said first and second account statements for printing in the batch printing run (§ 0273; § 0636; § 0642; § 1221; § 1230).

Scolini et al. does not teach:

Retrieving statement parameters applicable to the account statements, wherein the statement parameters include a recipient list, statement description, statement type, statement status, a number of copies to be generated, the designation for corporate review, and a designation for internal copies and, in accordance with the statement parameters; preventing the batch printing run until all individual account statements within the batch printing run are approved and released; includes the designation for corporate review; a designation for corporate review corresponding to at least one of: the first account and the second account, wherein said designation for corporate review is stored with statement parameters;

Tsuei et al. teaches:

Retrieving statement parameters applicable to the account statements, wherein the statement parameters include statement description, statement type, statement status, a number of copies to be generated, and, in accordance with the statement parameters (page 17, paragraphs 0145-0148; § 0123; § 0127; claims 1 and 11); are approved (§ 0113);

Therefore, it would be prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add retrieving statement parameters, wherein the statement parameters include statement description, statement type, statement status, a number of copies to be generated, and, in accordance with the statement parameters and are approved features to method

for generating account statements for batch printing of Scolini because Tsuei et al. teaches that adding the feature helps and makes the database available to distributors that need the information for relabeling (page 17, paragraph 0148 and page 2 paragraphs 0012-0021).

Geiger et al. teaches:

a recipient list, a designation for corporate review and internal copies (column 1, lines 15-34; column 4, lines 40-55; column 7, lines 31-41; column 25, lines 39-65); includes the designation for corporate review (column 1, lines 15-34; column 4, lines 40-55; column 7, lines 31-41; column 25, lines 39-65); a designation for corporate review, wherein said designation for corporate review is stored with statement parameters (column 1, lines 15-34; column 4, lines 40-55; column 7, lines 31-41; column 25, lines 39-65; column 22, lines 25-35);

Therefore, it would be prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a recipient list, a designation for corporate review, internal copies and includes the designation for corporate review and a designation for corporate review, wherein said designation for corporate review is stored with statement parameters features to method for generating account statements for batch printing of Scolini because Geiger et al teaches that adding the features helps to enables distributed network gatekeeping and review of the e-mail message by any number of corporate official designated as gatekeepers (page 17, paragraph 0148 and page 2 paragraphs 0012-0021).

Background of King et al. teaches:

preventing the batch printing run until all individual account statements within the batch printing run are released (§ 0002-0004); releasing the selected account statement for the batch printing run (§ 0002-0004);

Therefore, it would be prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add preventing the batch printing until the individual account statements and released for printing and releasing the selected account statement for the batch printing run features to method for a web-based, convergent communications billing solution for large-scale customer/users of Scolini, because background of King et al. teaches that adding the features help to prevent duplicate billing or loss of the individual statements (§ 0002-0004).

4. As per claim 2, Scolini et al. Tsuei et al., background of King et al. and Geiger et al. teach the method of claim 1 described above. Scolini further teaches said grouping further comprising:

grouping the plurality of accounts based on a group designation selected by the user (§ 0219; § 1207).

5. As per claim 3, Scolini et al., background of King et al., Tsuei et al. and Geiger et al. teach the method of claim 2 described above. Scolini further teaches said first and second account statements comprising at least one of a billing statement, a credit card statement, and a summary of investment holdings (§ 0920-0921).

6. As per claim 4, Scolini et al., background of King et al., Tsuei et al. and Geiger et al. teach the method of claim 3 described above. Scolini et al. further teaches said account data retrieved from a financial database (§ 0797-0798).

7. As per claim 5, Scolini et al., background of King et al., Tsuei et al. and Geiger et al. teach the method of claim 4 described above. Scolini et al. further teaches the method comprising:

receiving, from the user, a correction of the account data for the first account, wherein the correction is entered into the financial database (§ 0561; § 0856; § 1218).

8. As per claim 6, Scolini et al., background of King et al., Tsuei et al. and Geiger et al. teach the method of claim 5 described above. Scolini et al. further teaches the method comprising:

receiving, from the user, a selection of the second reporting format for the first account (§ 0273; § 0636; § 0642; § 1221; § 1230); and

generating a third account statement in the second reporting format for the first account, said first, second and third account statements for printing in the batch printing run (§ 0273; § 0636; § 0642; § 1221; § 1230).

9. As per claim 7, Scolini et al., background of King et al., Tsuei et al. and Geiger et al. teach the method of claim 6 described above. Scolini et al. further teaches the method comprising:

receiving, from the user, a selection of a third reporting format from the plurality of reporting formats for the second account (§ 0273; § 0636; § 0642; § 1221; § 1230); and

generating a third account statement in the third reporting format for the second account, said first, second and third account statements for printing in the batch printing run (§ 0273; § 0636; § 0642; § 1221; § 1230).



10. As per claim 8, Scolini et al., background of King et al., Tsuei et al. and Geiger et al. teach the method of claim 7 described above. Scolini further teaches the method comprising: designating at least one of the first and second account statements for quality review (§ 0006; 1358; page 59).

11. As per claim 9, Scolini et al., background of King et al., Tsuei et al. and Geiger et al. teach the method of claim 8 described above. Scolini et al. further teaches the method comprising comprising:

receiving, from the user, a parameter for generating the first and second account statements, the parameter including at least one of a time period for said account statements, a status of the accounts corresponding to said account statements, a corporate group responsible for the accounts, a number of copies of the account statements to be printed in the batch printing run (Figs. 16-18, 20-21), and a designation of whether the account statements are to undergo quality review (Figs. 21-22).

12. As per claim 10, Scolini et al., background of King et al., Tsuei et al. and Geiger et al. teach the method of claim 9 described above. Scolini et al. further teaches the method comprising:

printing the batch printing run after said generating and a completion of a quality review for all designated account statements in the batch printing run (§ 1259).

13. As per claim 11, claim 11 is equivalent of claim 1. Please refer to claim 1 rejection.

14. As per claim 12, claim 12 is equivalent of claim 2. Please refer to claim 2 rejection.

15. As per claim 13, claim 13 is equivalent of claim 3. Please refer to claim 3 rejection.

16. As per claim 14, claim 14 is equivalent of claim 4. Please refer to claim 4 rejection.

17. As per claim 15, claim 15 is equivalent of claim 5. Please refer to claim 5 rejection.

18. As per claim 16, Scolini et al., background of King et al., Tsuei et al. and Geiger et al. teach the method of claim 11 described above. Scolini et al. further teaches the method comprising: receiving, from the user, a selection of a second account from the plurality of accounts and a selection of the first reporting format for the second account (§ 0273; § 0636; § 0642); and generating a third account statement in the first reporting format for the second account, said first, second and third account statements for printing in the batch printing run (§ 0273; § 0636; § 0642; § 1221; § 1230).

19. As per claim 17, Scolini et al., background of King et al., Tsuei et al. and Geiger et al. teach the method of claim 11 described above. Scolini et al. further teaches the method comprising: receiving, from the user, a selection of a second account from the plurality of accounts and a selection of a third reporting format from the plurality of reporting formats for the second account (§ 0273; § 0636; § 0642); and generating a third account statement in the third reporting format for the second account, said first, second and third account statements for printing in the batch printing run (§ 0273; § 0636; § 0642; § 1221; § 1230).

20. As per claim 18, claim 18 is equivalent of claim 8. Please refer to claim 8 rejection.

21. As per claim 19, claim 19 is equivalent of claim 9. Please refer to claim 9 rejection.

22. As per claim 20, claim 20 is equivalent of claim 10. Please refer to claim 10 rejection.

23. As per claim 21, claim 21 is equivalent of claim 1. Please refer to claim 1 rejection.

24. As per claim 22, Scolini et al., background of King et al., Tsuei et al. and Geiger et al. teach the method of claim 21 described above. Scolini et al. further teaches wherein the account

is automatically designated for quality review unless changed by the user (§ 0006; § 1358; page 59; Figs. 21-22).

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 6/3/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding to claim 1, the Applicant argues that Scolini fails to disclose the claimed limitation "preventing the batch printing run until all individual account statements within the batch printing run are released". The Examiner disagrees. Scolini et al. discloses "prior systems generate and print statements as a batch printing job, whereby all account statements in the batch may only be printed together (in order to prevent duplicate billing or the loss of individual statements)" (see paragraphs 0002-0004) and Tsuei et al. discloses "are approved" (§ 0113). Therefore, Scolini discloses the claimed limitation.

Applicant further argues that Scolini fails to disclose the claimed limitation "approved and". The Examiner disagrees. Scolini et al. discloses Tsuei et al. discloses "approved" (§ 0113). Therefore, Tsuei et al. discloses the claimed limitation.

4. Regarding to claim 1, the Applicant argues that Scolini fails to disclose the claimed limitation "receiving, from a user corresponding to at least one of: the first account and the second account". The Examiner disagrees. Scolini discloses "accounts selection ... summary selection ... payment distribution selection .... usage by agency .... usage selection 1308 .... output files are created based on the customer's media format selections. A formatted trigger will be processed by the distribute process and will create one file for each of the media formats, selected by the customer. These files will be the input files for the Paper and NPM processes,

respectively. A customer can request any number of additional copies for any media, which they select for their account. For example, if a customer requests two copies of Paper bill, SIBS will need to provide two copies of the account's data in the file provided to the 2nd User Bill Print Center" (§ 0273; § 0636; § 0642). Therefore, Scolini discloses the claimed limitation.

The applicant further argues that Geiger fails to disclose "a designation for corporate review, wherein said designation for corporate review is stored with statement parameters". The Examiner disagrees. Geiger discloses "Many corporate organizations have elaborate methods to control the flow of memorandum, publications, notices, and other printed information within the organization ... Finally, organizations ordinarily have rules that prohibit distribution of certain types of documents, such as those containing disparaging, sexist, or profane materials. These various rules are typically documented as part of the organization's business communication policies, and managed by the personnel, human resources, or other departments. More particularly, the present invention provides the ability ... messages by altering the delivery of .. message from its specified recipients to a gatekeeping office, where they are stored for further review and handling... messages may be manually reviewed by a corporate administrator designated as a gatekeeper, and either released, returned to the sender, deleted, forwarded, or copied ... messages may also be automatically processed by an independent set of business rules, and again various different actions may be applied ... enables distributed, network gatekeeping and review of the e-mail messages by any number of corporate officials designated as gatekeepers. On a forward action, the distribution engine 284 updates the gatekeeping message index 287 to indicate that the message is released. The message is rewrapped with the gatekeeper ID and action taken (here forward and the reasons). The distribution list is updated to

place the GPO 106 of the new recipient as the next GPO 106 on the list; the current GPO 106 is added at the end of the distribution list. The new recipient may be another gatekeeper, or it may be any other recipient to whom it is useful to send the message for further processing and response. The distribution engine 284 then sends the message to the next GPO on the distribution list. The distribution engine 284 continues with the next message" (column 1, lines 15-34; column 4, lines 40-55; column 7, lines 31-41; column 25, lines 39-65; column 22, lines 25-35). Therefore, Geiger discloses the claimed limitation.

The applicant further argues that Scolini fails to disclose "assembling a directory of individual account statements, wherein said directory of individual account statements". The Examiner disagrees. Scolini discloses "Batching is determined by analyzing each account's print file header and evaluating its account attributes against a pre-defined batching scheme coded in the application driver. Once the account's pre-defined batching scheme has been determined, the ultimate file where the account is batched to is determined by performing a Batch Id table search. Statistics for each batch file are updated and additional header fields are formatted for use in the downstream PT process. Corresponding statistical records are written based on each account header. Each account's print file header (PFH) carries the necessary information to batch the account to the correct stack and burst output file. Tables also indicate how a summary is created by listing the summary module used to create the summary." (§ 1221; § 1230; § 0400; § 1177; § 1352; § 0006; § 0549, where "index" or "listing" is equivalent of "directory"). Therefore, Scolini discloses the claimed limitation.

The applicant further argues that Geiger fails to disclose "includes the designation for corporate review". The Examiner disagrees. Geiger discloses "Many corporate organizations

have elaborate methods to control the flow of memorandum, publications, notices, and other printed information within the organization ... Finally, organizations ordinarily have rules that prohibit distribution of certain types of documents, such as those containing disparaging, sexist, or profane materials. These various rules are typically documented as part of the organization's business communication policies, and managed by the personnel, human resources, or other departments. More particularly, the present invention provides the ability ... messages by altering the delivery of .. message from its specified recipients to a gatekeeping office, where they are stored for further review and handling... messages may be manually reviewed by a corporate administrator designated as a gatekeeper, and either released, returned to the sender, deleted, forwarded, or copied ... messages may also be automatically processed by an independent set of business rules, and again various different actions may be applied ... enables distributed, network gatekeeping and review of the e-mail messages by any number of corporate officials designated as gatekeepers. On a forward action, the distribution engine 284 updates the gatekeeping message index 287 to indicate that the message is released. The message is rewrapped with the gatekeeper ID and action taken (here forward and the reasons). The distribution list is updated to place the GPO 106 of the new recipient as the next GPO 106 on the list; the current GPO 106 is added at the end of the distribution list. The new recipient may be another gatekeeper, or it may be any other recipient to whom it is useful to send the message for further processing and response. The distribution engine 284 then sends the message to the next GPO on the distribution list. The distribution engine 284 continues with the next message" (column 1, lines 15-34; column 4, lines 40-55; column 7, lines 31-41; column 25, lines 39-65; column 22, lines 25-35). Therefore, Geiger discloses the claimed limitation.

The applicant further argues that Scolini fails to disclose "displaying the directory of individual account statements assembled for the batch printing run" The Examiner disagrees. Scolini discloses "Batching is determined by analyzing each account's print file header and evaluating its account attributes against a pre-defined batching scheme coded in the application driver. Once the account's pre-defined batching scheme has been determined, the ultimate file where the account is batched to is determined by performing a Batch Id table search. Statistics for each batch file are updated and additional header fields are formatted for use in the downstream PT process. Corresponding statistical records are written based on each account header. Each account's print file header (PFH) carries the necessary information to batch the account to the correct stack and burst output file. Tables also indicate how a summary is created by listing the summary module used to create the summary." (§ 1221; § 1230; § 0400; § 1177; § 1352; § 0006; § 0549, where "index" or "listing" is equivalent of "directory"). Therefore, Scolini discloses the claimed limitation.

The applicant further argues that Scolini fails to teach "receiving, from a reviewer, a selection of an account statement from the directory for review". The Examiner disagrees. Scolini discloses "The Validation Process is the interface between 1st User, 2nd User, 6th user, 4th user and the EBS system When the Start Bill Cycle process starts, it will review the input files, perhaps by fetching the data from the inventory tables. When the process identifies that all inputs have been received the cycle begins normally. There also exists a number of online billing providers or online customer service providers (CSPs), wherein one can go to the CSP's website to receive, view, and pay Online bills." (§ 0455; § 01358; page 59; § 1352; § 0004-0006). Therefore, Scolini disclosed the claimed limitation.

The applicant further argues that Scolini fails to teach “presenting the selected account statement to the reviewer”. The Examiner disagrees. Scolini discloses “customer can request any number of additional copies for any media, which they select for their account. For example, if a customer requests two copies of Paper bill, SIBS will need to provide two copies of the account's data in the file provided to the 2nd User Bill Print Center. this time, systems for Online Billing exist in many forms .... one can review a bill online, use interactive features to analyze calls, and schedule payments in advance” (§ 0642; § 01221; § 0004). Therefore, Scolini disclosed the claimed limitation.

The applicant further argues that Scolini fails to teach “receiving, from the reviewer, at least one of: an approval of the selected account statement, a rejection of the selected account statement, a correction of the selected account statement, a request for regeneration of the selected account statement, and a request to delete the selected account statement”. The Examiner disagrees. Scolini teaches “for purposes of organizing all billing information into a customer defined and maintained web-based hierarchy. provide the ability to process adjustments and disputes and to accept a single customer payment FOR a consolidated invoice; EBS system administrators will contact carriers when files are rejected. No new files will be sent by carriers until rejected files are corrected and resubmitted. When a file is rejected no files will be accepted from the carrier from whom the file came before the resubmission of the problematic file. Hence, new entries will be made to the inventory table only for files that pass the validation requirements.” (§ 0008; § 0447-0448; § 0470; § 1436; § 0004; § 0006). Therefore, Scolini disclosed the claimed limitation.



Applicant argues that background of King et al. fails to disclose “releasing the selected account statement for the batch printing run”. The Examiner disagrees. Background of King et al. teaches “generate and print statements as a batch printing job, whereby all account statements in the batch may only be printed together (in order to prevent duplicate billing or the loss of individual statements). If problems in any statements are discovered during quality review, the data for any such erroneous statements must be re-entered into the accounting system and the entire batch printing job must be run again” (§ 0002-0004). Therefore, background of King et al. disclosed the claimed limitation.

### ***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARISSA LIU whose telephone number is (571)270-1370. The examiner can normally be reached on IFP.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. L./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3694

/James P Trammell/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3694